

REMARKS

Claim 12 has been cancelled. Claims 8 and 22 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-11, and 13-28 are pending in the present application.

In the Office Action, claims 8-14 and 22-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the implement requirement. Independent claims 8 and 22 have been amended and, pursuant to these amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8-14 and 22-28 are enabled by the specification.

In the Office Action, claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Shi, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,757,897). The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Shi describes techniques that allow higher priority tasks to yield processing time to lower priority tasks. For example, a data transfer task 2.1 may perform its task for a first period of time and then provide a yield signal to a yielding scheduler 110. In response to receiving the yield signal, the yielding scheduler 110 temporarily disables performance of the data transfer task 2.1 by placing or moving the data transfer task 2.1 from a ready queue 110 to a yield queue 112. See Shi, col. 14, line 34-col. 15, line 3 and Figure 2. After a second period of time has elapsed, the yielding scheduler 110 re-enables performance of the data transfer task 2.1, e.g., by moving the data transfer task 2.1 from the yield queue 112 back into the ready queue 113. See Shi, col. 15, line 58-col. 16, line 3 and Figure 2.

Independent claims 1 and 15 set forth storing one or more tasks in a queue. Each task has an associated exit routine. Applicant respectfully submits that Shi fails to teach or suggest an exit routine associated with the tasks stored in the queue. The Examiner appears to be alleging that the function called by the data transfer task 2.1 to generate a yield interrupt (See Shi, col. 14, ll.

48-50) is an exit routine. Applicant respectfully disagrees and notes that the function called by the data transfer task 2.1 simply generates a signal, *i.e.*, the yield interrupt signal. Moreover, the yield interrupt signal does not result in the data transfer task 2.1 being exited. To the contrary, the yielding scheduler 110 only temporarily disables performance of the data transfer task 2.1 for a selected period before re-enabling performance of this task, as discussed above.

Claims 1 and 15 also set forth determining at least one task to process based on a priority scheme, processing the at least one task, and calling the exit routine based on determining that the task has not completed processing within a preselected period of time. Applicant respectfully submit that Shi does not describe or suggest calling an exit routine based on determining that a task has not completed processing within a preselected period of time. As discussed above, Shi does not teach or suggest calling an exit routine, but rather describes temporarily disabling tasks. Furthermore, the tasks described in Shi are not temporarily disabled based on a failure to complete within a preselected period of time. To the contrary, the tasks described in Shi may be temporarily disabled based upon a yield interrupt that may be provided in response to expiration of a timer. Applicant further submits that providing the yield interrupt in response to expiration of the timer is a part of the normal operation of the tasks and does not represent a failure of the task to complete.

Independent claims 8 and 22 set forth, among other things, a task picker stored in a queue that is also used to store other tasks. Applicant respectfully submits that Shi does not describe or suggest storing a task picker in the queue. To the contrary, Shi teaches that the yielding scheduler 110 is a separate entity that may be used to control both the yield queue 112 and the ready queue 113. The yielding scheduler 110 is not stored in either of these two queues. See Shi, Figure 2.

Independent claim 8 also sets forth executing the task picker until a preselected event occurs. Applicant respectfully submits that Shi does not teach or suggest interrupting or modifying operation of the yielding scheduler 110 under any circumstances. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Shi does not teach or suggest executing the task picker until a preselected event occurs.

Independent claim 22 also sets forth a controller configured to determine if the task completes execution within the preselected time interval, terminate the task in response to determining that the task failed to complete within the preselected time interval, and execute the task picker in response to terminating the task. As discussed above, Shi does not describe or suggest determining if a task completes execution within a preselected time interval or terminating the task in response to determining that the task failed to complete. To the contrary, the tasks described in Shi may be temporarily disabled based upon a yield interrupt that may be provided in response to expiration of the timer. Providing the yield interrupt in response to expiration of the timer is a part of the normal operation of the tasks described by Shi and does not represent a failure of the task to complete.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-28 are not anticipated by Shi and request that the Examiner's rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) be withdrawn.

For the aforementioned reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all claims pending in the present application are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (713) 934-4052 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

4/18/06



Mark W. Sincell, Ph.D.

Reg. No. 52,226

Williams Morgan & Amerson, P.C.

10333 Richmond Avenue, Suite 1100

Houston, TX 77042

(713) 934-7000

(713) 934-7011 (Fax)

AGENT FOR APPLICANTS